



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,134	01/21/2000	William J. Baer	STL000012US1	5405
23373	7590	01/31/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			PHAM, HUNG Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/489,134	Applicant(s) BAER ET AL.	
	Examiner HUNG Q. PHAM	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-99 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- The applicants have amended claim 30. The objection of claim 30 is withdrawn.
- Applicant's arguments filed 08/26/2005 with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 30, 31, 60, 61 and 90 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at page 19:

"[S]toring said custom content object in said one or more object servers" is described at, for example, page 8, lines 14-19 and page 9, lines 7-11 of the specification. See also, Fig. 3, object server 48.

"[S]toring attribute information concerning the custom content object in said one or more object servers" is described at, for example, page 10, lines 10-15. "[S]toring information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information in the library server" is described at, for example, page 8, lines 20-23, page 12, lines 1-5 and page 39, lines 1-5. See also, Fig. 3, library server 44.

*Therefore, Applicant submits that the claim recitations are disclosed in the specification. Consequently, the 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 30, 31, 60, 61 and 90 should be **withdrawn**.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees, and the rejection is maintained because of the following reasons.

As disclosed in the specification at page 6, lines 18-25:

The present invention will now be described in terms of a specific embodiment for creating custom textbooks. The intended user group comprises university, for example. The content stored in the system comprises a plurality of published textbooks, broken down into hierarchically related objects: book, volume, chapter and chapter subsection.

Using the proposed system in this context, a university professor is able to access content from a collection of textbooks stored in a digital library and select books, volumes, chapters and/or chapter

Art Unit: 2168

subsections for inclusion in a custom textbook, and is further to create content objects for inclusion in the final work.

Page 8, lines 14-19, is the description of how a *library server* manages digital objects.

Page 9, lines 7-11, is the illustration of how the *library server* handles a request involves storage, retrieval, or update of an object.

FIG. 3 indicates an *object server 48* and *library server 44*.

Page 10, lines 10-15, is the description of how an "object server 48" maintains objects stored within the library system. Referring to FIG. 3, page 10, lines 10-15, further discloses *the object server field in the library server's parts table 62 indicates the identifier for the object server 48, the object server ID field will contain the identifier for object server 48.*

Page 8, lines 20-23, illustrates the function of *library server 44*.

Page 12, lines 1-5, illustrates the process of storing an object in the library system using library client 42 to send a storage request to *library server 44*.

Page 39, lines 1-5, indicates *Attribute Files are parsed and the resultant parametric data is stored in the digital library server 44.*

As recited in claims 1, 30, 31, 60, 61 and 90, e.g., claim 1:

A computer-implemented method for creating a compilation from a collection of content stored in a digital library having a library server, one or more object servers, the method comprising:

presenting a plurality of selectable objects to a user, each object representing a subset of the collection of content

in response to selection by a user of one or more of said object, creating a custom content object that specifies a hierarchical compilation of the content represented by each selected object;

storing said custom content object in said one or more object servers;

storing attribute information concerning the custom content object in said one or more object servers; and

storing information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information in the library server.

Thus, in light of the specification, the claimed *custom content object* is "a custom textbook" as illustrated at page 6, lines 18-25, and *selectable objects*, e.g., "book", "volume", "chapter" and "chapter subsection", are stored within the "library system" and maintained by "object server 48". Nowhere in the referenced pages and lines have the description of the steps *storing said custom content object in said one or more object servers, storing attribute information concerning the custom content object in said one or more object servers, and storing information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information in the library server.*

- The applicants have amended claims 30, 60 and 90. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of these claims is withdrawn.

- Applicant's arguments filed 08/26/2005 with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 11-23, 25-28, 30-31, 36-38, 41-53, 55-58, 60-61, 66-68, 71-83, 85-88, 90-91, 94 and 97 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at pages 20-22:

The Examiner asserts that the screen shot on page 9 of the McGraw Hill power point presentation with the button "view" for retrieving the content of a particular chapter implies the technique of storing as recited in claim 1. However, as indicated above, the Examiner has not established where an object server is disclosed, let alone that a custom content object and attribute information are stored in an object server.

Art Unit: 2168

Moreover, the standard for determining obviousness is whether there is a teaching or suggestion in the prior art that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify or combine references and not whether the prior art "implies" the claimed recitation.

...

Santamaki provides no teaching or suggestion of storing information specifying a custom content object and attribute information concerning the custom content object in a library server (allegedly the a-book server 30, shown in Fig. 1 of Santamaki, as cited by the Examiner) in addition to storing the custom content object and attribute information in one or more object servers as required by claim 1.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The screen shot on page 9 indicates a *custom content object and attribute information concerning the custom content object*, e.g., book ID, and the screen shot on page 6 indicates *information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information*, e.g., text book "Patterson: We the People, Third Edition". The missing of McGraw Hill is *one or more object servers and the library server*.

As disclosed by Santamaki at Col. 5, Lines 6-16, a centralized server for storing the electronic written materials, and an e-book server for storing selected electronic written materials that have been converted into an electronic book format to subsequent download to a terminal for viewing.

A centralized server as *library server*, and an e-book server as *one or more object servers*, obviously, could be used to stored *information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information*, e.g., text book "Patterson: We the People, Third Edition", and *custom content object and attribute information concerning the custom content object*, e.g., book ID.

Art Unit: 2168

- Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 2-3, 29, 32-33, 59, 62-63 and 89 have been fully considered but they are unpatentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 31 and 61, and reason as set forth above.
- Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 4-5, 34-35 and 64-65 have been fully considered but they are unpatentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 31 and 61, and reason as set forth above.
- Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 9-10, 24, 39-40, 54, 69-70, 84, 92-93, 95-96 and 98-99 have been fully considered but they are unpatentable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 31 and 61, and reason as set forth above.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2168

Claims 1, 30, 31, 60, 61 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As in claims 1, 30, 31, 60, 61 and 90, the steps of *storing said custom content object in said one or more object servers; storing attribute information concerning the custom content object in said one or more object servers; and storing information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information in the library server* were not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was


Art Unit: 2168

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6-8, 11-23, 25-28, 30-31, 36-38, 41-53, 55-58, 60-61, 66-68, 71-83, 85-88, 90-91, 94 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The McGraw-Hill Companies [McGraw Hill Primis Custom Publishing] in view of Santamaki et al. [USP 6,886,036 B1].


Regarding claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill teaches a method and system for creating a customized textbook. The interface as illustrated at page 7 is *a collection of content*.

In order to create a customized textbook, the McGraw-Hill method has a GUI as below for *presenting a plurality of* Chapter and Sections as *selectable objects to a user each* Chapter and Section as *object representing* Business Law as *a subset of the collection of content*;



in response to selection by a user of one or more of chapters and sections as objects by using the add button, a custom content object that specifies a hierarchical compilation of the content represented by each selected object is created (based on the selected chapters and sections, the screenshot below as a custom content object is created to specify a customized textbook as a hierarchical compilation of the content represented by each selected object).

Art Unit: 2168



The screen shot on page 9 indicates a *custom content object* and *attribute information* concerning the *custom content object*, e.g., book ID, and the screen shot on page 6 indicates *information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information*, e.g., text book "Patterson: We the People, Third Edition". The missing of McGraw Hill is *one or more object servers* and *the library server*.

As disclosed by Santamaki at Col. 5, Lines 6-16, a centralized server for storing the electronic written materials, and an e-book server for storing selected electronic written materials that have been converted into an electronic book format to subsequent download to a terminal for viewing.

A centralized server as *library server*, and an e-book server as *one or more object servers*, obviously, could be used to stored *information specifying the custom content object and the attribute*

Art Unit: 2168

information, e.g., text book "Patterson: We the People, Third Edition", and *custom content object* and *attribute information concerning the custom content object*, e.g., book ID.

By using centralized server as *library server*, and an e-book server as *one or more object servers* for storing information, the selectable text books and custom text book could be stored separately to distinguish the information between compiling and downloading process.

Regarding claims 6, 36 and 66, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the collection of content comprises hierarchically related data* (page 7).

Regarding claims 7, 37 and 67, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 6, 36 and 66, McGraw-Hill further disclose *the collection of content comprises text documents and the subset of content associated with each selectable object comprises at least one of a section* (pages 3 and 7).

Regarding claims 8, 38 and 68, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *displaying to the user the selected objects in a predetermined order such that the user may rearrange the order of the selected objects as desired through a user interface* (Review and Resequencing, page 9).

Regarding claims 11, 41 and 71, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses the step of *receiving content input by a user and creating a selectable object from the content* (pages 5-7).

Regarding claims 12, 42 and 72, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the user may concurrently create a plurality of compilations* (pages 7, 9 and 12).

Regarding claims 13, 43 and 73, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses the step *presenting the compilation to a user for modification after creation of the compilation* (page Review and Resequencing of page 9).

Regarding claims 14, 44 and 74, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 13, 43 and 73, McGraw-Hill further discloses the step of *creating a copy of the compilation, applying changes input by a user to the copy, and creating a new compilation therefrom* (page 3).

Regarding claims 15, 45 and 75, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 13, 43 and 73, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the user may select an object for removal from the compilation* (Microsoft Powerpoint presentation presenting how to user Primis Online).

Regarding claims 16, 46 and 76, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the user may select to clear the compilation* (Microsoft Powerpoint presentation presenting how to user Primis Online).

Regarding claims 17, 47 and 77, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill does not explicitly disclose *the user may select to undo an operation affecting the compilation*. However, undo an operation that affecting a compilation is a conventional operation such as the undo in Word Editor. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill method by including the technique of undoing an object from a compilation in order to compile a document.

Regarding claims 18, 48 and 78, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses the claimed *submitting the compilation to an approval*

Art Unit: 2168

process after creation of the compilation (Microsoft Powerpoint presentation presenting how to user Primis Online).

Regarding claims 19, 49 and 79, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 18, 48 and 78, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the approval process further comprises one of approving the compilation for publication; rejecting the compilation* (Microsoft Powerpoint presentation presenting how to user Primis Online).

Regarding claims 20, 50 and 80, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the presenting step further comprises the step of presenting all of the content comprising the collection of content to the user as a plurality of selectable objects* (page 7).

Regarding claims 21, 51 and 81, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the presenting step further comprises the step of presenting less than all of the content comprising the collection of content to the user as a plurality of selectable objects* (pages 5-7).

Regarding claims 22, 52 and 82, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 21, 51

Art Unit: 2168

and 81, McGraw-Hill further discloses the step of *partitioning the collection of content into a plurality of categories, and presenting all content objects belonging to a category to a user* (page 5).

Regarding claims 23, 53 and 83, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses the step of *receiving search criteria input by the user; determining which of the subsets of the collection of content satisfy the search criteria; and presenting to the user a plurality of selectable objects corresponding to the subsets of content satisfying the search criteria* (pages 5-6).

Regarding claims 25, 55 and 85, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *a selectable object further comprises one of a container and a content entity* (page 7).

Regarding claims 26, 56 and 86, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 25, 55 and 85, McGraw-Hill further discloses *in response to selection of the container to add to a compilation, adding the selected container and any containers or content entities it contains to the compilation* (Microsoft Powerpoint presentation presenting how to user Primis Online).



Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claims 27, 57 and 87, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the selectable objects further comprise titles of their associated subsets of content* (page 7).

Regarding claims 28, 58 and 88, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 25, 55 and 85, McGraw-Hill further discloses *containers are at least one of a book, a volume, and a chapter* (page 7).

Regarding claims 30, 60 and 90, McGraw-Hill discloses a method of compiling a customized textbook from a collection of content stored in a database (pages 1-3). The first screen shot indicates *a plurality of content objects stored in McGraw-Hill side as a digital library, each content object comprising a plurality of hierarchically related content entities.*

in response to selection one of the hierarchically related content entities to include in a hierarchical compilation (as in the first screen shot below, a user can select a hierarchically related content entity, e.g., chapter or section, to include in the process of compiling a hierarchical customized textbook), *creating a custom content object* (as indicates in the second screen shot below) *that specifies a compilation of a customized textbook from the selected content entities.*



The screen shot on page 9 indicates a *custom content object* and *attribute information* concerning the custom content object, e.g., book ID, and the screen shot on page 6 indicates

Art Unit: 2168

information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information, e.g., text book "Patterson: We the People, Third Edition". The missing of McGraw Hill is *one or more object servers* and *the library server*.

As disclosed by Santamaki at Col. 5, Lines 6-16, a centralized server for storing the electronic written materials, and an e-book server for storing selected electronic written materials that have been converted into an electronic book format to subsequent download to a terminal for viewing.

A centralized server as *library server*, and an e-book server as *one or more object servers*, obviously, could be used to stored *information specifying the custom content object and the attribute information*, e.g., text book "Patterson: We the People, Third Edition", and *custom content object* and *attribute information concerning the custom content object*, e.g., book ID.

By using centralized server as *library server*, and an e-book server as *one or more object servers* for storing information, the selectable text books and custom text book could be stored separately to distinguish the information between compiling and downloading process.

Regarding claims 91, 94 and 97, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the compilation of content is created automatically in response to the user selecting said one or more of said objects* (page 7).

Art Unit: 2168

Claims 2-3, 29, 32-33, 59, 62-63 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The McGraw-Hill Companies [McGraw Hill Primis Custom Publishing] in view of Mortimer et al. [USP 6,091,930].

Regarding claims 2, 32 and 62, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the collection of content comprises at least one of a book, a document, an image* but does not teach a *collection of musical selections and a video*. Mortimer teaches a technique of creating a customized student book and the collection of content comprises a collection of musical selections and a video (Mortimer, FIG. 2a). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill method by including audio, and video in the collection of content in order to construct an electronic book embedded with audio, and video.

Regarding claims 3, 33 and 63, McGraw-Hill, Santamaki and Mortimer, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 32 and 62, McGraw-Hill further discloses *subsets of content comprise one of a chapter and sections of a text document* (McGraw-Hill, page 7).

Regarding claims 29, 59 and 89, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 25, 55 and 85, McGraw-Hill further discloses *the collection of content comprises at least one of a book*

Art Unit: 2168

(McGraw-Hill, page 5). McGraw-Hill does not teach *the collection of content comprises at least one of image album and videos*. Mortimer teaches a technique of creating a customized student book and the collection of content comprises image album and a video (Mortimer, FIG. 2a). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill method by including image and video in the collection of content in order to construct an electronic book embedded with image and video.

Claims 4-5, 34-35 and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The McGraw-Hill Companies [McGraw Hill Primis Custom Publishing] in view of ksinclair.com [Free E-books You Can Download].

Regarding claims 4, 34 and 64, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, but fails to disclose *each selectable object is associated with a cost, and further comprising the step of calculating a cost for the created compilation based upon the costs of the selected objects*.

Ksinclair.com has a website that presenting a plurality of e-books to a user and a user could open or download the e-book to the user site by selecting the title of an e-book.

Ksinclair.com further discloses *each selectable object is associated with a cost* but fails to disclose the step of *calculating a cost for the created compilation based upon the costs of the selected objects*.

However, a cost for a created compilation is a service charge based on the cost of maintaining an object such as an e-book and could be calculated upon the cost of that

Art Unit: 2168

e-book. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill method by applying the cost of an object from ksinclair.com method and including the cost of created compilation based upon the cost of the object in order to maintain the system.

Regarding claims 5, 35 and 65, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill further disclosed the step of *determining a content count for the compilation* (McGraw-Hill, page 7), but not the step of *determining a cost for the compilation based upon the content count*. Ksinclair.com has a website that presenting a plurality of e-books to a user and a user could open or download the e-book to the user site by selecting the title of an e-book. The downloadable ksinclair.com e-book has a cost associated with the e-book (ksinclair.com). Thus the cost of the compilation for a particular chapter could be calculated based upon the content count. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill method by applying the cost of an object from ksinclair.com method and including the cost of created compilation based upon the content count in order to maintain the system.

Claims 9-10, 24, 39-40, 54, 69-70, 84, 92-93, 95-96 and 98-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by The McGraw-Hill

Art Unit: 2168

Companies [McGraw Hill Primis Custom Publishing] in view of Poole et al. [USP 6,006, 242].

Regarding claims 9, 39 and 69, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, but does not disclose the step of *defining a maximum amount of allowable content per volume of content; creating a plurality of volumes of content from the selected content based upon the defined maximum*. Poole teaches an apparatus and method for dynamically constructing an electronic document for subsequent publication in pre-printed or electronic form (Poole, Col. 1, Lines 15-20). Poole further discloses the step of *defining a maximum amount of allowable content per volume of content; creating a plurality of volumes of content from the selected content based upon the defined maximum* (Poole, FIG. 17). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill technique by including the step of defining a maximum amount of content in order to compile an e-book online.

Regarding claims 10, 40 and 70, McGraw-Hill, Santamaki and Poole, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 9, 39 and 69, Poole further discloses the step of *displaying to the user the selected objects contained in each volume such that the user may selectably move an object from a first to a second of the volumes* (Poole, Col. 11, lines 25-50).

Regarding claims 24, 54 and 84, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, but does not explicitly disclose *at least one of the subsets of content is associated with one or more prerequisite subsets of content and upon selection by the user of a selectable object associated with the at least one subset, also including the associated prerequisite subsets of content in the created compilation*. Poole teaches an apparatus and method for dynamically constructing an electronic document for subsequent publication in pre-printed or electronic form (Poole, Col. 1, Lines 15-20). Poole further discloses *at least one of the subsets of content is associated with one or more prerequisite subsets of content and upon selection by the user of a selectable object associated with the at least one subset, also including the associated prerequisite subsets of content in the created compilation* (Col. 7, Lines 1-6). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill technique to include the nested object in order to compile an e-book with embedded pictures or graphics.

Regarding claims 92, 95 and 98, McGraw-Hill and Santamaki, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 31 and 61, McGraw-Hill does not explicitly disclose *the compilation of content is created by recording in a computer-readable structure defining the compilation, for each selected object, a reference to the content entity associated with the selected object*. Poole teaches an apparatus and method for dynamically constructing an electronic document for subsequent publication in pre-printed or electronic form (Poole, Col. 1, Lines 15-20). Poole further discloses *the compilation of content is created by recording in a computer-readable structure defining the compilation, for each selected object, a reference to the content entity associated with the selected object* (FIG. 5). It would

Art Unit: 2168

have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the McGraw-Hill technique by referencing the content entities in order to compile an e-book.

Regarding claims 93, 96 and 99, McGraw-Hill, Santamaki and Poole, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 92, 95 and 98, Poole further discloses *the computer-readable structure defining the compilation in a custom content outline (CCO) containing the references that correspond to the selected objects, and wherein said references are identifiers of the content entities associated with the selected objects* (FIG. 5).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY A. GAFFIN can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


HUNG Q PHAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

January 25, 2006